

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action dated June 22, 2006, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on September 22, 2006, and the Interview Summary dated August 1, 2006. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 134-149 remain pending in the application and are shown above. Claims 134-149 stand rejected by the Examiner. Reconsideration of the rejected claims is requested for reasons presented below. Claim 138 is objected to.

Claim 138 is amended to correct matters of form. Claim 134 is amended to clarify the invention. Claim 134 is amended to require the source to be movable away from the lower portion. Support for the amendment may be found at least at page 16, lines 4-8. These amendments are not presented to distinguish a reference, thus, the claims as amended are entitled to a full range of equivalents if not previously amended to distinguish a reference.

Regarding the interview of July 27, 2006, Examiner Dhingra is thanked for granting the telephonic interview. Applicants agree with the Examiner's Interview Summary, but respectfully disagree with the Examiner's conclusion.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As an initial matter, it is presumed that the Examiner has rejected claim 134 and not claim 1 because claim 1 was not pending at the time of the Final Office Action. In regards to the Examiner's assertion that the specification teaches that the source of process fluid and the manifold are separate items so that the manifold is movable, but the source is not, Applicants respectfully traverse. In the telephonic interview conducted July 27, 2006, the Examiner stated that "source" would cover all items through which the fluid flows including a fluid tank, piping, etc. Because the fluid passes through the manifold, the manifold would qualify as a source according to the Examiner's definition. Therefore, it is believed that there is indeed support in the

specification as originally filed for the limitation that the source is movable. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 134, 135, 137, 141, 143, and 145-149 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Andreas et al* [(US Patent No. 6,273,100) in view of *Bran* (US Patent No. 5,556,479)]. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Andreas et al. and *Bran* do not teach, show, or suggest the source is moveable away from the lower portion of the chamber because the valve disclosed in *Bran* is not movable away from the lower portion of the chamber. The valve has a portion (*i.e.*, the valve stem) that moves, but the valve itself does not move away from the lower portion of the chamber. Additionally, while the valve stem may move, the valve stem does not move away from the lower portion of the chamber. Therefore, *Andreas et al.* and *Bran*, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the source is moveable away from the lower portion of the chamber, as recited in claim 134, and claims dependent thereon. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Regarding claim 146, *Andreas et al.* and *Bran* do not teach, show, or suggest the overflow weir having at least two ports coupled thereto. The Examiner has admitted that *Andreas et al.* does not disclose the overflow weir to have at least two ports coupled thereto (see Final Office Action mailed June 22, 2006, page 7), but then does not address whether *Bran* teaches the overflow weir having at least two ports coupled thereto. *Bran* does not show the overflow weir having at least two ports coupled thereto. Therefore, *Andreas et al.* and *Bran*, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the overflow weir having at least two ports coupled thereto, as recited in claim 146, and claims dependent thereon. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 136, 139, 142, 144, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over *Andreas et al* (US Patent No. 6,273,100) in view of *Bran* (US Patent No. 5,556,479) as applied to Claim 135 and further in view of *Fishkin et al* (US Patent No. 6,328,814). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As an initial matter, it is assumed that the Examiner has intended to reject the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103 and not 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Claims 136, 139, 142, and 144 all depend from claim 134, which is believed to be allowable as noted above. As

also noted above, *Andreas et al.* and *Bran*, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the source is moveable away from the lower portion of the chamber, as recited in claim 134. *Fishkin et al.* does not cure the deficiencies of *Andreas et al.* and *Bran*. Therefore, *Andreas et al.*, *Bran*, and *Fishkin et al.*, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the source is moveable away from the lower portion of the chamber, as recited in claims 136, 139, 142, and 144. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 138 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over *Andreas et al.* (US Patent No. 6,273,100) in view of *Bran* (US Patent No. 5,556,479) as applied to Claim 134 and further in view of *Fishkin et al.* (US Patent No. 6,311,702). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As an initial matter, it is assumed that the Examiner has meant to reject the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103 and not 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Claim 138 depends from claim 134, which is believed to be allowable as noted above. As also noted above, *Andreas et al.* and *Bran*, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the source is moveable away from the lower portion of the chamber, as recited in claim 134. *Fishkin et al.* does not cure the deficiencies of *Andreas et al.* and *Bran*. Therefore, *Andreas et al.*, *Bran*, and *Fishkin et al.*, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the source is moveable away from the lower portion of the chamber, as recited in claim 138. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the invention as claimed.

Having addressed all issues set out in the Final Office Action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Keith M. Tackett
Registration No. 32,008
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicants